Unambiguous discrimination of linearly independent pure quantum states: Optimal average probability of success

Somshubhro Bandyopadhyay*

Department of Physics and Center for Astroparticle Physics and Space Science, Bose Institute, Block EN, Sector V, Bidhan Nagar, Kolkata 700091

arXiv:1404.3574v3 [quant-ph] 6 Sep 2014

Abstract

We consider the problem of unambiguous (error-free) discrimination of N linearly independent pure quantum states with prior probabilities, where the goal is to find a measurement that maximizes the average probability of success. We derive an upper bound on the optimal average probability of success using a result on optimal local conversion between two bipartite pure states. We prove that for any $N \geq 2$ an optimal measurement in general saturates our bound. In the exceptional cases we show that the bound is tight, but not always optimal.

*Electronic address: som@jcbose.ac.in

One of the consequences of the superposition principle is that quantum states could be nonorthogonal, which restricts our ability to reliably determine the state of a quantum system even when the set of possible states is known. Thus a fundamental problem in quantum mechanics is to determine how well quantum states can be distinguished from one another (see [1, 2] for reviews). In its simplest form, the problem is defined as follows: A quantum system is prepared in one of N known pure states $|\psi_1\rangle, |\psi_2\rangle, \ldots, |\psi_N\rangle$ with associated probabilities $p_1, p_2, \ldots, p_N$, where $0 < p_i < 1$ for every i and $\sum_{i=1}^{N} p_i = 1$. We do not know which state the system is in, but wish to identify it. If the states are mutually orthogonal, the solution is straightforward. However, if the states are not mutually orthogonal, then quantum mechanics forbids us from distinguishing them perfectly. Therefore, the objective is to devise a measurement strategy that is optimal according to some reasonable quantifier of distinguishability. This scenario is typical in quantum information theory, especially in quantum communications and quantum cryptography.

In this paper we consider how well a given set of pure states can be discriminated without error. This measurement strategy, known as unambiguous discrimination, seeks *certain* knowledge of the state of the system balanced against a probability of failure. Since no error is permitted, in addition to the measurement outcomes that correctly identify the input state, an inconclusive outcome, which is not informative, must be allowed. That is, either the input state is correctly detected or the outcome is inconclusive, in which case we do not learn anything about the state. It may be noted that in other strategies such as minimum error discrimination [1, 2] and maximum confidence measurements [2], we cannot in general be completely sure of the identity of the input state.

Unambiguous discrimination of pure quantum states is possible if and only if the states are linearly independent [3]. This assumption will therefore hold throughout this paper. The measurement is described by a POVM $\mathbf{\Pi} = \{\Pi_k\}$ with $N+1$ outcomes. where $\Pi_k \geq 0$ and $\sum_{k=1}^{N+1} \Pi_k = I$. The POVM elements $\{\Pi_k \,|k = 1, \ldots, N\}$ are associated with success and satisfy,

$$\langle \psi_i \,|\Pi_j|\, \psi_j \rangle \;=\; \gamma_i \delta_{ij}, \;\; \forall i, j = 1, \ldots, N \tag{1}$$

where γ_i is the probability of successfully detecting the state $|\psi_i\rangle$. Note that Eq. (1) implies that if the system is in state $|\psi_i\rangle$, the outcome $j \neq i$ for $j = 1, \ldots, N$ will never occur. The operator $\Pi_{N+1} = I - \sum_{i=1}^{N} \Pi_i$ corresponds to an inconclusive outcome. Notice that the set

of individual success probabilities $\{\gamma_1, \ldots, \gamma_N\}$ is determined only by our choice of POVM. Thus for a given measurement $\mathbf{\Pi}$, the average probability of success is defined as

$$P(\mathbf{\Pi}) = \sum_{i=1}^{N} p_i \gamma_i. \tag{2}$$

The goal is to find a measurement that maximizes the average probability of success. In particular, we are interested in the following quantity:

$$P_{\text{opt}} = \max_{\{\mathbf{\Pi}\}} P(\mathbf{\Pi}) = \sum_{i=1}^{N} p_i \gamma_i^{\text{opt}} \tag{3}$$

where the optimal solution $\boldsymbol{\gamma}^{\text{opt}} = \left\{ \gamma_i^{\text{opt}} \,|i = 1, \ldots, N \right\}$ is the set of individual success probabilities maximizing the average probability of success. The optimal solution is known only for $N = 2$ [4–7], and special cases for $N \geq 3$ [8–10, 12, 13]. General results include lower [14, 15] and upper [16] bounds on the average probability of success, a solution for N equi-probable symmetric states [17], a formulation of the problem as a semi-definite program with results for symmetric and geometrically uniform states [18], characterization of optimal solutions [8], a graphic method for finding and classifying optimal solutions [9], and solution for equidistant states [19].

Before we state our results it is necessary to briefly review all possible classes of optimal solution [8], precise definitions of which are given in the appendix. For a given set of N linearly independent pure states let $\mathcal{R}$ be the set of all candidate optimal solutions. This set, said to be the critical feasible region, is an $(N-1)$-dimensional region (hypersurface) in the N-dimensional real vector space $\mathbb{R}^N$, and is completely determined by the input states and the constraints imposed by the problem. Once we specify the prior probabilities, the optimal solution, which is an element of $\mathcal{R}$ becomes unique in the sense that there is no other solution that is also optimal for the same set of prior probabilities. Different sets of prior probabilities in general lead to different optimal solutions within the set $\mathcal{R}$.

The optimal solution is either an interior or a boundary point of $\mathcal{R}$. If it is an interior point then it means that the optimal measurement is able to discriminate all states, i.e., for every i, $0 < \gamma_i^{\text{opt}} \leq 1$. On the other hand, if it is a boundary point, then at least one of the optimal individual success probabilities is zero. We say that an interior point is nonsingular if the solution is nondegenerate, i.e., it can be the optimal solution only for an unique set of prior probabilities. An interior point can also be singular if the solution is degenerate,

i.e., it can be the optimal solution for different sets of prior probabilities. It should be noted that interior singular points are exceptions and may not even exist for a given set of states. Thus there are only three possible classes of optimal solution: interior nonsingular, interior singular and boundary.

Using the conditions in [8], it is easy to show that for a given set of states, every interior nonsingular point is the optimal solution for some set of prior probabilities. Noting that the critical feasible region is of dimension $N-1$, the dimension of the interior part is also $N-1$, whereas the dimensions of the boundary regions are strictly less than $N-1$. Therefore, for almost all assignments of prior probabilities, the optimal solution will be an interior nonsingular point. In other words, for any given instance of an unambiguous state discrimination problem, the optimal solution in general will be an interior nonsingular point of the critical feasible region.

In this work we derive an upper bound on the optimal average probability of success using a result [20, 21] on optimal local conversion between two bipartite pure states. We prove that the bound is saturated when the optimal solution is an interior nonsingular point of the critical feasible region, which is the set of all candidate optimal solutions. From the previous argument we therefore conclude that for any given set of $N \geq 2$ linearly independent pure states with prior probabilities, the upper bound in general equals the optimal average probability of success.

When the optimal solution is either an interior singular point or a boundary point, we show that the upper bound is tight. However, we also show that it is not achieved in general by an optimal boundary solution. The question, whether an optimal solution that is an interior singular point always saturates our bound remains open.

We begin by obtaining an upper bound on the optimal average probability of success.

Theorem 1. *Suppose a quantum system is prepared in one of the linearly independent pure states* $|\psi_1\rangle, \ldots, |\psi_N\rangle$ *with prior probabilities* $p_1, \ldots, p_N$ *respectively, where* $0 < p_i < 1$ *for every* i *and* $\sum_{i=1}^{N} p_i = 1$. *For an optimal unambiguous state discrimination measurement, the average success probability* P_{opt} *is bounded by*

$$P_{\text{opt}} \leq \min_{\{\theta_j\}} \left\| \sum_{j=1}^{N} \sqrt{p_j} e^{i\theta_j} |\psi_j\rangle \right\|^2 . \tag{4}$$

Essentially we are required to minimize the norm of the vector $\sum_{j=1}^{N} \sqrt{p_j} e^{i\theta_j} |\psi_j\rangle$ with respect to the real parameters $\{\theta_j \,|j = 1, \ldots, N\}$ we are free to vary. Because of this we can always set one of the θ_i, say, θ_1, equal to zero and minimize the norm with respect to the remaining $N-1$ parameters. However, it is often useful to express inequality (4) in a form where the parameters defining the inner products of the states become explicit. Let $\langle\psi_i|\psi_j\rangle = |\langle\psi_i|\psi_j\rangle| e^{\phi_{ij}}$, $i < j$, We then have,

$$P_{\text{opt}} \leq 1 + \min_{\{\theta_i\}} \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq N} 2\sqrt{p_i p_j} \, |\langle\psi_i|\psi_j\rangle| \cos\left(\theta_j - \theta_i + \phi_{ij}\right). \tag{5}$$

We shall use (5) in the examples given later in the paper and appendix.

The proof of the theorem relies on two facts. First, any set of linearly independent quantum states can be unambiguously discriminated [3]. This simply means that one can always find a measurement, which may not be optimal, that unambiguously discriminates all states. Second, a pure bipartite entangled state with d nonzero Schmidt coefficients can be converted, with some nonzero probability, to a maximally entangled state in $d \otimes d$ by LOCC. The optimal probability of such a local conversion can be obtained using the result in [20, 21] and is stated in the following lemma (proof in appendix).

Lemma 1. *Let $|\Psi\rangle_{AB} = \sum_{i=1}^{d} \sqrt{\alpha_i} |i\rangle_A |i\rangle_B$ be a bipartite pure entangled state, where $\left\{\sqrt{\alpha_i}\right\}$ are the Schmidt coefficients such that $\alpha_1 \geq ... \geq \alpha_d > 0$ and $\sum_{i=1}^{d} \alpha_d = 1$. Then the optimal probability with which $|\Psi\rangle_{AB}$ can be locally converted to a maximally entangled state in $d \otimes d$ is given by $d\alpha_d$.*

Proof. (Theorem 1) For convenience we first sketch the main idea behind the proof. We shall begin with a scenario of local conversion between two bipartite states (say, source and target), where the target state is maximally entangled. The source state is so constructed that (a) any measurement, say, $\mathbf{\Pi}$, on Alice's side that unambiguously discriminates the states $\{|\psi_j\rangle \,|j = 1, \ldots, N\}$ constitutes a local protocol for the aforementioned state transformation, and (b) the probability of local conversion, say, $P(\mathbf{\Pi})$, thus obtained is exactly equal to the average probability of success in an unambiguous discrimination scenario, where the measurement $\mathbf{\Pi}$ distinguishes the states $\{p_j, |\psi_j\rangle \,|j = 1, \ldots, N\}$. However, for any $\mathbf{\Pi}$, $P(\mathbf{\Pi})$ is bounded by the optimal local conversion probability obtained from Lemma 1. An upper bound on the optimal average probability of success follows by choosing Alice's measurement to be optimal for unambiguous discrimination, that is, $\mathbf{\Pi} = \mathbf{\Pi}^{\text{opt}}$. Further refinement leads

us to inequality (4). We now give the formal proof in three key steps.

(i) Consider a bipartite scenario with two spatially separated observers, Alice and Bob, with Alice holding quantum systems A_1 and A_2 of dimensions $N' \geq N$ and N, respectively, and Bob holding a quantum system B of dimension N. Alice and Bob share the following pure state

$$\left|\psi^{\boldsymbol{\theta}}\right\rangle_{AB} \;=\; \sum_{j=1}^{N} \sqrt{p_j} e^{i\theta_j} \left|\psi_j\right\rangle_{A_1} \otimes \left|\Phi_j\right\rangle_{A_2 B}, \tag{6}$$

where $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ represents the collection of parameters $\{\theta_i \,|i = 1, \ldots, N\}$ allowed to vary and $\{|\Phi_j\rangle \,|j = 1, \ldots, N\}$ is a set of N mutually orthonormal maximally entangled states in $N \otimes N$ defined as

$$|\Phi_j\rangle \;=\; \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{k=1}^{N} \exp\left(\frac{2\pi i\,(k-1)\,(j-1)}{N}\right) |k\rangle\,|k\rangle, \;\; j = 1, \ldots, N. \tag{7}$$

Suppose Alice and Bob wish to convert $\left|\psi^{\boldsymbol{\theta}}\right\rangle_{AB}$ to a maximally entangled state, say, $|\Phi\rangle_{AB}$ in $N \otimes N$, by LOCC. This can be achieved by a local protocol, which is not necessarily optimal, where Alice performs a generalized measurement (POVM) $\boldsymbol{\Pi} = \{\Pi_k \,|k = 1, \ldots, N+1\}$ on system A_1 that unambiguously discriminates the states $\{|\psi_j\rangle \,|j = 1, \ldots, N\}$. The POVM elements $\{\Pi_k \,|k = 1, \ldots, N\}$ satisfy Eq. (1), where the outcomes $j = 1, \ldots, N$ correspond to success and the outcome $j = N + 1$ corresponds to failure. If the outcome is j, the measurement successfully detects the state $|\psi_j\rangle$ for $j = 1, \ldots, N$. From the expression of $\left|\psi^{\boldsymbol{\theta}}\right\rangle_{AB}$ given by Eq. (6) it is evident that this occurs with probability $p_j \gamma_j$, and for each of these cases the corresponding maximally entangled state $|\Phi_j\rangle$ is created between Alice and Bob. For $j = N + 1$, the outcome is inconclusive, and therefore will not be our concern.

The above local protocol, with some nonzero probability, converts the state $\left|\psi^{\boldsymbol{\theta}}\right\rangle_{AB}$ to a maximally entangled state in $N \otimes N$. Note that for every successful outcome, the maximally entangled state created between Alice and Bob, can be converted to the designated state $|\Phi\rangle_{AB}$ by local unitaries. Thus the probability of creating a maximally entangled state between Alice and Bob with this local protocol is $P(\boldsymbol{\Pi}) = \sum_{j=1}^{N} p_j \gamma_j$, which is the same as the average probability of success in unambiguous discrimination of the states $\{p_j, |\psi_j\rangle \,|j = 1, \ldots, N\}$ with the measurement $\boldsymbol{\Pi}$.

Now suppose that the POVM $\boldsymbol{\Pi} = \boldsymbol{\Pi}_{\text{opt}}$, that is, the measurement is optimal for unambiguous discrimination of the states $\{p_j, |\psi_j\rangle \,|j = 1, \ldots, N\}$. Then $P_{\text{opt}} = \sum_{j=1}^{N} p_j \gamma_j^{\text{opt}}$,

which by our previous argument is also the probability, not necessarily optimal, of locally converting the state $\left|\psi^{\boldsymbol{\theta}}\right\rangle_{AB}$ to $|\Phi\rangle_{AB}$. However, P_{opt} cannot exceed the optimal local conversion probability $p\left(\psi^{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{AB} \to \Phi_{AB}\right)$ that can be obtained by applying Lemma 1. Therefore,

$$P_{\text{opt}} \;\leq\; p\left(\psi^{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{AB} \to \Phi_{AB}\right). \tag{8}$$

(ii) To obtain an expression for $p\left(\psi^{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{AB} \to \Phi_{AB}\right)$ we first write $\left|\psi^{\boldsymbol{\theta}}\right\rangle_{AB}$ in its Schimdt-decomposed form:

$$\left|\psi^{\boldsymbol{\theta}}\right\rangle \;=\; \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{k=1}^{N} \left\||\eta_k\rangle\right\| \left|\eta'_k k\right\rangle_{A_1A_2} |k\rangle_B \,, \tag{9}$$

where $|\eta_k\rangle$ (unnormalized) is given by

$$|\eta_k\rangle \;=\; \sum_{r=1}^{N} \sqrt{p_r} e^{i\theta_r} \exp\left(\frac{2\pi i}{N}\,(r-1)\,(k-1)\right) |\psi_r\rangle \tag{10}$$

and $|\eta'_k\rangle \;=\; \frac{1}{\||\eta_k\rangle\|}\,|\eta_k\rangle$ is the normalized state. Observe that (9) is indeed the Schmidt decomposition of $\left|\psi^{\boldsymbol{\theta}}\right\rangle_{AB}$ owing to $\langle\eta'_k k|\eta'_m m\rangle = \langle\eta'_k|\eta'_m\rangle\,\langle k|m\rangle = \langle\eta'_k|\eta'_m\rangle\,\delta_{km}$. The Schmidt coefficients are given by $\frac{\||\eta_k\rangle\|}{\sqrt{N}},\ k = 1, \ldots, N$, where for every k, $\||\eta_k\rangle\| > 0$. Thus all Schmidt coefficients are nonzero. Then from Lemma 1 it follows that

$$p\left(\psi^{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{AB} \to \Phi_{AB}\right) \;=\; \min_k \left\{ \left\||\eta_k\rangle\right\|^2 | k = 1, \ldots, N \right\}. \tag{11}$$

It can be easily seen that $p\left(\psi^{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{AB} \to \Phi_{AB}\right)$ depends on $\{\theta_i \,|i = 1, \ldots, N\}$, inner products of the states $\{|\psi_r\rangle \,|r = 1, \ldots, N\}$, and the probabilities $\{p_i \,|i = 1, \ldots, N\}$. Of all these only the real parameters θ_i can be varied, everything else remaining fixed for a given set $\{p_i, |\psi_i\rangle \,|i = 1, \ldots, N\}$.

Noting that P_{opt} does not depend on $\{\theta_i\}$, inequality (8) therefore holds for *any* set $\{\theta_i\}$, and in particular any set that minimizes $p\left(\psi^{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{AB} \to \Phi_{AB}\right)$. Therefore,

$$P_{\text{opt}} \;\leq\; \min_{\{\theta_i\}} p\left(\psi^{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{AB} \to \Phi_{AB}\right), \tag{12}$$

gives us the best possible bound on P_{opt} using this approach.

(iii) To evaluate the right-hand.side of (12) we proceed as follows. First, we observe that

$$\min_{\{\theta_i\}} p\left(\psi^{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{AB} \to \Phi_{AB}\right) \;=\; \min_k \left\{ \min_{\{\theta_i\}} \left\||\eta_k\rangle\right\|^2 | k = 1, \ldots, N \right\}. \tag{13}$$

Next, we prove the following equality:

$$\min_{\{\theta_i\}} \| |\eta_k\rangle \|^2 \;=\; \min_{\{\theta_i\}} \| |\eta_j\rangle \|^2 , \tag{14}$$

for every pair (k, j). To prove Eq. (14) we first express $\| |\eta_k\rangle \|^2$ as,

$$\| |\eta_k\rangle \|^2 \;=\; \left\| \sum_{r=1}^{N} \sqrt{p_r} e^{i\theta'_r(k)} \, |\psi_r\rangle \right\|^2 , \tag{15}$$

where $\theta'_r(k) \;=\; \theta_r \;+\; \frac{2\pi}{N}(r-1)(k-1)$ for $r \;=\; 1, \ldots, N$. Now suppose that the set $\{\theta_r \,|r = 1, \ldots, N\}$ minimizes $\| |\eta_k\rangle \|^2$. Noting that (15) has exactly the same form of $\| |\eta_1\rangle \|^2$, the set $\{\theta'_r(k) \,|r = 1, \ldots, N\}$ therefore minimizes $\| |\eta_1\rangle \|^2$. A similar argument holds for every $i, i \neq k$. We have therefore proved (14) and consequently,

$$\min_{\{\theta_i\}} p\left(\psi^{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{AB} \to \Phi_{AB}\right) \;=\; \min_{\{\theta_i\}} \| |\eta_k\rangle \|^2 \;\; \forall k = 1, \ldots, N \tag{16}$$

Inequalities (12) and (16) for $k = 1$ together prove the theorem. □

We now show that the upper bound in (4) is saturated when the optimal solution is a nonsingular interior point of the critical feasible region $\mathcal{R}$. Therefore in a generic case the optimal average probability of success is equal to the upper bound given by Theorem 1.

Theorem 2. *Let a quantum system be prepared in one of the linearly independent pure states $|\psi_1\rangle, \ldots, |\psi_N\rangle$ with prior probabilities $p_1, \ldots, p_N$ respectively, where $0 < p_i < 1$ for every i and $\sum_{i=1}^{N} p_i = 1$. For an optimal unambiguous state discrimination measurement, suppose that the solution is an interior nonsingular point of the critical feasible region. Then*

$$P_{opt} \;=\; \min_{\{\theta_i\}} \left\| \sum_{j=1}^{N} \sqrt{p_j} e^{i\theta_j} \, |\psi_j\rangle \right\|^2 . \tag{17}$$

Proof. In [8] it was shown that if $\boldsymbol{\gamma}^{\mathrm{opt}}$ is an interior nonsingular point of the critical feasible region, then P_{opt} can be expressed as

$$P_{\mathrm{opt}} \;=\; \left\| \sum_{j} \sqrt{p_j} e^{i\theta'_j} \, |\psi_j\rangle \right\|^2 , \tag{18}$$

but no explicit expressions of the phases $e^{i\theta'_j}$ were given. However, it was noted that P_{opt} must be the value of a stationary point if the phases are allowed to change freely. Note that

without the explicit knowledge of the phases or knowing how to obtain them (a stationary point may be a minimum or maximum), Eq. (18) is not very useful.

However, the upper bound in Theorem 1 [inequality (4)] which holds irrespective of the class of optimal solution, fills this gap. Consequently,

$$P_{\text{opt}} \;=\; \min_{\{\theta_i\}} \left\| \sum_j \sqrt{p_j} e^{i\theta_j} \left|\psi_j\right\rangle \right\|^2 . \tag{19}$$

This proves the theorem and also shows that the stationary point must be a minimum. □

It is not clear whether our bound saturates for the other two classes of optimal solution, as the expression (18) was obtained [8] assuming that the optimal solution is an interior nonsingular point of the critical feasible region. However, by considering examples from each of the other two classes, we first show that the upper bound given by Theorem 1 is tight for both. The third example shows that for a boundary solution, the optimal value could be strictly less than the value obtained from our bound. Therefore, an optimal boundary solution will not in general saturate our bound.

Example I: boundary point. We begin by considering an example for $N = 3$ [13], where the given states, $|\psi_1\rangle = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}^T$,$|\psi_2\rangle = \sqrt{\frac{1}{3}} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}^T$, and $|\psi_3\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & -1 \end{pmatrix}^T$ are equally likely. Noting that the inner products are all real, inequality (5) becomes (set $\theta_1 = 0$)

$$P_{\text{opt}} \;\leq\; 1 + \min_{\{\theta_2,\theta_3\}} \frac{2}{3\sqrt{3}} \left[\cos\theta_2 + \cos\theta_3 + \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} \cos\left(\theta_3 - \theta_2\right) \right]$$

By simple numerical minimization using Mathematica we find that $P_{\text{opt}} \leq 0.4444$. In [13] it was shown that $\boldsymbol{\gamma}^{\text{opt}} = \left\{0, \frac{2}{3}, \frac{2}{3}\right\}$, from which we obtain $P_{\text{opt}} = \frac{4}{9} = 0.4444$. Thus the upper bound is achieved. As one of the individual success probabilities is zero, the optimum point is therefore on the boundary.

It is easy to construct an example for any $N \geq 4$ starting from the one we just discussed. Here we give an example for $N = 4$, from which it will be evident how to generalize for higher N. Consider the set of states $\{|\psi_i\rangle \,|i = 1, \ldots, 4\}$, where the first three states are from the above example, and the new state $|\psi_4\rangle$ has the property that $|\psi_4\rangle \perp |\psi_i\rangle$ for $i = 1, 2, 3$. We choose the prior probabilities as $p_i = \frac{1-p}{3}$ for $i = 1, 2, 3$ and $p_4 = p$, where $0 < p < 1$. In this case, using inequality (5) we find that

$$P_{\text{opt}} \;\leq\; p + 0.4444\,(1 - p)$$

To show that the above bound is tight, we find the optimal set of the individual success probabilities. Noting that $|\psi_4\rangle$ is orthogonal to every other state, it is easy to obtain that $\gamma^{\rm opt} = \left\{0, \frac{2}{3}, \frac{2}{3}, 1\right\}$ and $P_{\rm opt} = p + \frac{4}{9}(1-p)$, thereby achieving the upper bound.

Example II: interior singular point. We begin by considering such an example for $N = 3$ [8]. Consider the following vectors $|\psi_1\rangle = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}^T$, $|\psi_2\rangle = \sqrt{\frac{1}{5}} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2 & 0 \end{pmatrix}^T$ and $|\psi_3\rangle = \frac{2}{\sqrt{17}} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & \frac{3}{2} \end{pmatrix}^T$, with prior probabilities $p_1 = 0.30$, $p_2 = 0.35$, and $p_3 = 0.35$ respectively. We see that the inner products are real. Using inequality (5), a simple numerical minimization using Mathematica shows that $P_{\rm opt} \leq 0.4430$ which agrees with the optimal value [8]. Following the method used in the previous example, we can therefore generalize this example for any $N \geq 4$.

Example III: In this example we show that the upper bound does not saturate in general for an optimal boundary solution. This example is from [8], where the states $|\psi_1\rangle = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}^T$, $|\psi_2\rangle = \sqrt{\frac{1}{5}} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2 & 0 \end{pmatrix}^T$ and $|\psi_3\rangle = \frac{2}{\sqrt{17}} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & \frac{3}{2} \end{pmatrix}^T$ occur with prior probabilities $p_1 = 0.10$, $p_2 = 0.80$, and $p_3 = 0.10$ respectively. Once again using inequality (5), a simple numerical minimization using Mathematica shows that $P_{\rm opt} \leq 0.4758$, which is pretty close to the optimal value $P_{\rm opt} = 0.4632$ [8].

To conclude, we studied the problem of unambiguous discrimination of N linearly independent pure quantum states, where the measurement strategy is such that either the input state is correctly identified (zero error) or we learn nothing about it. The objective is to find a measurement that maximizes the average probability of success. This problem has been extensively studied over the years, but the exact solution is known only for $N = 2$, and special cases for $N \geq 3$. In this paper we obtained an upper bound on the optimal average probability of success using a result [20, 21] on optimal local conversion between two bipartite pure states. We showed that for $N \geq 2$ an optimal measurement in general saturates our bound, thereby providing an exact expression of the optimal average probability of success in the generic case. In the exceptional cases we have shown that the bound is tight, but not always attained for an optimal boundary solution.

Acknowledgement. The author is grateful to Sibasish Ghosh and Michael Nathanson for comments on the manuscript and very useful discussions. Discussions with Rahul Jain, R Rajesh and Manik Banik are gratefully acknowledged. This research is supported in part

by DST-SERB project SR/S2/LOP-18/2012.

[1] A. Chefles, Quantum state discrimination, Contemporary Physics 41, 401 (2000).

[2] S. M. Barnett and S. Croke, Quantum state discrimination, Advances in Optics and Photonics 1 238 (2009).

[3] A. Chefles, Unambiguous discrimination between linearly independent quantum states, Phys. Lett. A 239, 339 (1998).

[4] I. D. Ivanovic, How to differentiate between non-orthogonal states, Phys. Lett. A 123, 257 (1987).

[5] D. Dieks, Overlap and distinguishability of quantum states, Phys. Lett. A 126, 303 (1988).

[6] A. Peres, How to differentiate between non-orthogonal states, Phys. Lett. A 128, 19 (1988).

[7] G. Jaeger and A. Shimony, Optimal distinction between two non-orthogonal quantum states, Phys. Lett. A 197, 83 (1995).

[8] S. Pang and S. Wu, Optimum unambiguous discrimination of linearly independent pure states, Phys. Rev. A 80. 052320 (2009).

[9] J. A. Bergou, U. Futschik, and E. Feldman, Optimal unambiguous discrimination of pure quantum states, Phys. Rev. Lett. 108, 250502 (2012).

[10] A. Peres and D. R. Terno, Optimal distinction between non-orthogonal quantum states, J. Phys. A 31, 7105 (1998).

[11] M. A. Jafarizadeh, M. Rezaei, N. Karimi, and A. R. Amiri, Optimal unambiguous discrimination of quantum states, Phys. Rev. A 77, 042314 (2008).

[12] H. Sugimoto, T. Hashimoto, M. Horibe, and A. Hayashi, Complete solution for unambiguous discrimination of three pure states with real inner products, Phys. Rev. A 82, 032338 (2010).

[13] Y. Sun, M. Hillery, and J. A. Bergou, Optimum unambiguous discrimination between linearly independent nonorthogonal quantum states and its optical realization, Phys. Rev. A 64, 022311 (2001).

[14] L.-M. Duan and G.-C. Guo, "Probabilistic cloning and identification of linearly independent quantum states," Phys. Rev. Lett. 80, 4999–5002 (1998).

[15] X. Sun, S. Zhang, Y. Feng and M. Ying, "Mathematical nature of and a family of lower bounds

for the success probability of unambiguous discrimination," Phys. Rev. A 65, 044306 (2002).

[16] S. Zhang, Y. Feng, X. Sun and M. Ying, "Upper bound for the success probability of unambiguous discrimination among quantum states," Phys. Rev. A 64, 062103 (2001).

[17] A. Chefles and S. M. Barnett, Optimum unambiguous discrimination between linearly independent symmetric states, Phys. Lett. A 250, 223 (1998).

[18] Y. Eldar, A semidefinite programming approach to optimal unambiguous discrimination of quantum states, IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory 49, 446 (2003).

[19] L. Roa, C. Hermann-Avigliano, R. Salazar, and A. B. Klimov, Conclusive discrimination among N equidistant pure states, Phys. Rev. A 84, 014302 (2011).

[20] H. K. Lo and S. Popescu, Concentrating entanglement by local actions: Beyond mean values, Phys. Rev. A 63, 022301 (2001).

[21] G. Vidal, Entanglement of pure states for a single copy, Phys.Rev.Lett. 83, 1046 (1999).

APPENDIX

I. PROOF OF LEMMA 1

Let $|\Psi\rangle_{AB} = \sum_{i=1}^{d} \sqrt{\alpha_i}\,|i\rangle_A\,|i\rangle_B$ be a bipartite pure entangled state, where $\left\{\sqrt{\alpha_i}\right\}$ are the Schmidt coefficients such that $\alpha_1 \geq \cdots \geq \alpha_d > 0$ and $\sum_{i=1}^{d} \alpha_d = 1$. Let $|\Phi\rangle$ be a maximally entangled state in $d \otimes d$. From Vidal's Theorem [21], the optimal probability of local conversion $|\Psi\rangle \to |\Phi\rangle$ is given by

$$P(\Psi_{AB} \to \Phi) = \min_{l \in [1,d]} q_l,$$

where

$$q_l = \frac{\sum_{i=l}^{d} \alpha_i}{\frac{1}{d}(d-l+1)}.$$

Because $\alpha_1 \geq \alpha_2 \geq ... \geq \alpha_d > 0$, we have $\sum_{i=l}^{d} \alpha_i \geq (d-l+1)\alpha_d$. Therefore, for every l, $l = 1, ..., d-1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} q_l &= \frac{\sum_{i=l}^{d} \alpha_i}{\frac{1}{d}(d-l+1)} \\ &\geq \frac{(d-l+1)\alpha_d}{\frac{1}{d}(d-l+1)} \\ &= d\alpha_d \\ &= q_d. \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof.

II. CLASSES OF OPTIMAL SOLUTION

Here we define all possible classes of optimal solution following [8]. Consider the sets of individual success probabilities $\{\gamma_1, \gamma_2, \ldots, \gamma_N\}$ and the prior probabilities $\{p_1, p_2, \ldots, p_N\}$ as vectors $\boldsymbol{\gamma}$ and $\mathbf{p}$ respectively in the N dimensional real vector space $\mathbb{R}^N$. For convenience (and to avoid any confusion) we adapt the nomenclature of [8] and refer to these vectors as "points". Now for a given set of states, the set of possible optimal solutions is determined by the constraints imposed by the problem of unambiguous discrimination.

Define the matrices $X = \Lambda^\dagger \Lambda$ and Γ, where Λ is the matrix whose i^{th} column is $|\psi_i\rangle$ and $\Gamma \geq 0$ is a diagonal matrix, whose diagonal elements are the success probabilities γ_i. It was shown [8] that the set of points $\boldsymbol{\gamma}$ (denote by S) satisfying the constraints $X - \Gamma \geq 0$ and $\Gamma \geq 0$ imposed by the problem, is convex. The set S is said to be the feasible set. The critical feasible region $\mathcal{R}$ is defined as the set of points $\boldsymbol{\gamma} \in S$ satisfying $\sigma_{\min}(\boldsymbol{\gamma}) = 0$, where $\sigma_{\min}$ is the minimum eigenvalue of $X - \Gamma$. This set is closed. Note that the critical feasible region is in fact the set of candidate optimal solutions and is fixed for a given set of states. Once we specify the prior probabilities, the optimal solution becomes unique in the sense that there is no other solution which is also optimal for the same set of prior probabilities. Different sets of prior probabilities in general lead to different optimal solutions within the set $\mathcal{R}$.

It was shown [8] that the optimal solution $\boldsymbol{\gamma}^{\text{opt}} \in \mathcal{R}$ is either an interior nonsingular point (that is, $\nabla \sigma_n(\boldsymbol{\gamma})\,|_{\boldsymbol{\gamma}^{\text{opt}}} = -\mathbf{p}$), or an interior singular point($\nabla \sigma_n(\boldsymbol{\gamma}) = \mathbf{0}$), or a point on the boundary of $\mathcal{R}$. If it is an interior point (nonsingular or singular) then it means that the optimal measurement is able to discriminate all states, that is, for every i, $0 < \gamma_i^{\text{opt}} \leq 1$. On the other hand, if it is a boundary point, then at least one of the optimal individual success probabilities is zero. Moreover, an interior nonsingular optimal solution is nondegenerate, i.e., it's the optimal solution for an unique set of prior probabilities, wheras an interior singular point solution is degenerate, which implies that it can be the optimal solution for different sets of prior probabilities. It should be noted that interior singular points are exceptions and may not even exist for a given set of states. For the necessary and sufficient conditions pertaining to these optimal solutions and further details please see [8].

III. EXAMPLES

Here we illustrate with several examples where our bound is saturated.

A. Two states

For two states inequality (5) reduces to

$$P_{\text{opt}} \;\leq\; 1 + \min_{\theta_1,\theta_2} 2\sqrt{p_1 p_2}\,|\langle\psi_1\,|\psi_2\rangle|\cos\left(\theta_2 - \theta_1 + \phi_{12}\right).$$

Because ϕ_{12} is fixed, the minimum is clearly given by choosing θ_2, θ_1 such that $\theta_2 - \theta_1 + \phi_{12} = \pi$. Set $\theta_1 = 0$, and $\theta_2 = \pi - \phi_{12}$ yielding

$$P_{\text{opt}} \;\leq\; 1 - 2\sqrt{p_1 p_2}\,|\langle\psi_1\,|\psi_2\rangle|\,. \tag{20}$$

The upper bound given by (20) matches the IDP result [4–6] obtained when the states are equally likely and the more general result by Jaeger and Shimony [7] for unequal prior probabilities.

B. Three states

The case $N = 3$ has been extensively studied, but an analytical solution is not known except for special cases. Here we consider several examples from the literature, and show that our bound is tight in each case. We first write (5) explicitly for $N = 3$, where without loss of generality, we have set $\theta_1 = 0$.

$$\begin{aligned} P_{\text{opt}} \;\leq\; 1 + \min_{\theta_2,\theta_3} 2\,[&\sqrt{p_1 p_2}\,|\langle\psi_1\,|\psi_2\rangle|\cos\left(\theta_2 + \phi_{12}\right) + \sqrt{p_1 p_3}\,|\langle\psi_1\,|\psi_3\rangle|\cos\left(\theta_3 + \phi_{13}\right) \\ &+ \sqrt{p_2 p_3}\,|\langle\psi_2\,|\psi_3\rangle|\cos\left(\theta_3 - \theta_2 + \phi_{23}\right)]\,. \end{aligned} \tag{21}$$

Example 1

Suppose that $\langle\psi_1\,|\psi_2\rangle = 0$, but $\langle\psi_1\,|\psi_3\rangle \neq 0$, $\langle\psi_2\,|\psi_3\rangle \neq 0$, then inequality (21) becomes

$$P_{\text{opt}} \;\leq\; 1 + \min_{\theta_2,\theta_3} 2\,[\sqrt{p_1 p_3}\,|\langle\psi_1\,|\psi_3\rangle|\cos\left(\theta_3 + \phi_{13}\right) + \sqrt{p_2 p_3}\,|\langle\psi_2\,|\psi_3\rangle|\cos\left(\theta_3 - \theta_2 + \phi_{23}\right)] \tag{22}$$

The minimum of the right hand side is given by θ_2, θ_3 satisfying

$$\begin{aligned} \cos(\theta_3 + \phi_{13}) &= -1 \\ \cos(\theta_3 - \theta_2 + \phi_{23}) &= -1 \end{aligned}$$

The above two equations are satisfied for $\theta_3 = \pi - \phi_{13}$, and $\theta_2 = \phi_{23} - \phi_{13}$. We therefore have

$$P_{\text{opt}} \leq 1 - 2\left[\sqrt{p_1 p_3}\,|\langle\psi_1|\psi_3\rangle| + \sqrt{p_2 p_3}\,|\langle\psi_2|\psi_3\rangle|\right]. \tag{23}$$

which matches the optimal value obtained in [8].

Example 2

This example is from [9], where the authors introduced the invariant phase also known as the geometric phase. Denote the complex overlaps of the states as $\langle\psi_1|\psi_2\rangle = |\langle\psi_1|\psi_2\rangle|\, e^{i\phi_3}$ and two more cyclic permutation of the indices. The invariant phase ϕ, defined as $\phi = \phi_1 + \phi_2 + \phi_3$ corresponds to the phase deficit associated with a closed path in the parameter space.

To make the connection explicit we rewrite inequality (21) with the following substitutions $\phi_{12} = \phi_3$, $-\phi_{13} = \phi_2$ and $\phi_{23} = \phi_1$:

$$\begin{aligned} P_{\text{opt}} \leq 1 + \min_{\theta_2,\theta_3} 2\big[&\sqrt{p_1 p_2}\,|\langle\psi_1|\psi_2\rangle|\cos(\theta_2 + \phi_3) + \sqrt{p_1 p_3}\,|\langle\psi_1|\psi_3\rangle|\cos(\theta_3 - \phi_2) \\ &+ \sqrt{p_2 p_3}\,|\langle\psi_2|\psi_3\rangle|\cos(\theta_3 - \theta_2 + \phi_1)\big]. \end{aligned} \tag{24}$$

Noting that $\phi = \sum_{i=1}^{3} \phi_i$,

$$\begin{aligned} P_{\text{opt}} \leq 1 + \min_{\theta_2,\theta_3} 2\big[&\sqrt{p_1 p_2}\,|\langle\psi_1|\psi_2\rangle|\cos\alpha + \sqrt{p_1 p_3}\,|\langle\psi_1|\psi_3\rangle|\cos\beta \\ &+ \sqrt{p_2 p_3}\,|\langle\psi_2|\psi_3\rangle|\cos(\alpha - \beta + \phi)\big], \end{aligned} \tag{25}$$

where $\alpha = \theta_2 + \phi_3$, $\beta = \theta_3 - \phi_2$. When $\phi = \pi$, minimum of the r.h.s. of (25) is obtained for $\alpha = \beta = \pi$, giving the following upper bound:

$$P_{\text{opt}} \leq 1 - 2\left[\sqrt{p_1 p_2}\,|\langle\psi_1|\psi_2\rangle| + \sqrt{p_1 p_3}\,|\langle\psi_1|\psi_3\rangle| + \sqrt{p_2 p_3}\,|\langle\psi_2|\psi_3\rangle|\right],$$

which agrees with the optimal value [9] obtained when $\gamma_i > 0$ for every i.

Example 3

The *a priori* probabilities are equal and the overlap of the three states are real and equal

$$\langle\psi_1|\psi_3\rangle = \langle\psi_1|\psi_3\rangle = \langle\psi_2|\psi_3\rangle = s \;:\; 0 < s < 1$$

Inequality (21) becomes

$$P_{\text{opt}} \;\leq\; 1 + \frac{2s}{3} \times \min_{\theta_2,\theta_3} \left[\cos\theta_2 + \cos\theta_3 + \cos\left(\theta_3 - \theta_2\right)\right].$$

A simple minimization using Mathematica shows that $\min\left[\cos\theta_2 + \cos\theta_3 + \cos\left(\theta_3 - \theta_2\right)\right] = -\frac{3}{2}$. Therefore,

$$P_{\text{opt}} \;\leq\; 1 - s,$$

which matches the optimal value obtained in [13].

C. Four states

Here we will consider unambiguous discrimination of four geometrically uniform states with equal prior probabilities [18]. Geometrically uniform states are defined over a group $\mathcal{G}$ of unitary matrices and are obtained by a single generating vector. Consider the group $\mathcal{G}$ of $N = 4$ unitary matrices U_i defined as:

$$U_1 = I_4,\; U_2 = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 \end{bmatrix},\; U_3 = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 \end{bmatrix},\; U_4 = U_2U_3$$

The states that we wish to discriminate are given by: $|\psi_i\rangle = U_i|\psi\rangle\,;\, i = 1,\ldots,4$, where $|\psi\rangle = \frac{1}{3\sqrt{2}}\begin{pmatrix} 2 & 2 & 1 & 3 \end{pmatrix}^T$. The states are assumed to be equally likely. Then from inequality (5)

$$P_{\text{opt}} \;\leq\; 1 + \min_{\{\theta_2,\theta_3,\theta_4\}} \frac{1}{18}\left[-4\cos\theta_2 - \cos\theta_3 + \cos\theta_4 + 4\cos\left(\theta_3 - \theta_2\right) - \cos\left(\theta_4 - \theta_2\right) - 4\cos\left(\theta_4 - \theta_3\right)\right].$$

The r.h.s is numerically minimized using Mathematica and we find that

$$P_{\text{opt}} \;\leq\; 0.2222,$$

which is in agreement with the optimal value $\frac{2}{9}$ [18].